

JENNIFER FRIEDNASH

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and applaud Jennifer Friednash for her outstanding service to our community.

Jennifer works full time as a real estate attorney, but always finds time to teach her kids the value of volunteering through leading by example. She has been an active member and fundraiser for Project PRIDE, which constructed an outdoor classroom alongside Red Rocks Amphitheatre.

Jennifer's work doesn't stop there. She is an active committee member of the Jefferson Economic Council, chair of a committee that provides junior NAIOP members an opportunity to learn about the real estate industry from seasoned professionals and has been a provisional instructor for the Colorado Association of Realtors.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jennifer Friednash for her well deserved recognition by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

**IKE SKELTON NATIONAL DEFENSE  
AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL  
YEAR 2011**

SPEECH OF

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters on H.R. 6523 for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECH-  
NOLOGY,

Washington, DC, December 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SKELTON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in H.R. 6523, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 6523 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of this bill by the House.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERV-  
ICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 21, 2010.

Hon. BART GORDON,  
Chairman, House Committee on Science and  
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6523, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Science and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration of this important measure. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Science and Technology is not waiving its jurisdictional claims over these matters.

During consideration of this bill on the House floor, I will ask that this exchange of letters be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,  
Chairman.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. HENRY CUELLAR**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I was absent due to personal family matters, but if present, I would have voted "yes" on:

S. 3481—Amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution.

S. 372—Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act.

Senate Amendment to H.R. 6523—Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

**STATEMENT OF CONCERN ABOUT  
UNJUST IMPRISONMENT OF  
BAHA'I RELIGIOUS MINORITY IN  
IRAN**

**HON. DANNY K. DAVIS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express both my deep concern and the deep concern of some of my constituents about the unjust imprisonment of several members of a religious minority in Iran. In particular, I wish to speak of the member of the Baha'i faith who have been persecuted and imprisoned in Iran. My home district in Chicago has a rich diversity of people from all backgrounds and faiths, and I am fortunate to have Baha'is as part of this rich diversity. The Baha'i faith is a peaceful religion that teaches the oneness of humanity and that all forms of prejudice should be eliminated.

Some of you will recall that in 2009 I was one of the co-sponsors to House Resolution 175. That resolution condemned the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights. H. Res. 175 passed with 407

"aye" votes on October 22, 2009. However, some of my constituents have informed me that the persecution and suppression of the Baha'i faith in Iran persist with no relief in sight.

In 2009 the international press reported that seven Baha'i leaders in Iran were unjustly arrested and held in prison without knowing the charges for their arrest for approximately 20 months.

The unjust prosecution of these seven particular Baha'is was condemned by international leaders and drawn into our national awareness for a short time. Those seven Baha'is are real people with families, who continue to suffer injustice because of their peaceful religious beliefs. The more disturbing fact is that those seven Baha'i leaders are merely the ones that made the headlines. There are approximately 48 additional Baha'is currently imprisoned in Iran. Approximately 132 Baha'is have been arrested and released on bail to await trial, and another 92 Baha'is have been sentenced to imprisonment. In the last decade, hundreds of Baha'is have been prosecuted and imprisoned for their religious beliefs. But that is not the only degradation that Baha'is in Iran must face. Baha'is have been dismissed from their jobs, expelled from universities, and deprived of their property and pensions, all because of their religious beliefs.

Our national consciousness would not be so aware of this unjust and unfair treatment if it had not been for yet another unjust prosecution of a young American journalist, Roxana Saberi, in 2009. While Roxana shared a prison cell with two of the female Baha'i leaders in Evin prison, she was astounded by the tranquility of her Baha'i cell mates even as they faced harsh conditions and uncertainty about their future. Fortunately, Roxana was freed from prison and has returned safely to the United States; however, those seven Baha'i leaders remain in prison and were sentenced to 10 years of confinement in one of the most dreadful prisons in Iran.

In short, the Baha'i faith teaches tolerance, patience, peace and self-investigation of the truth. Yet, Baha'is are singled out and marked from persecution and ridicule from the class room to the court room and from the lunch room to the laboratory. We have our own history of unjust treatment in this country and the grievous and slow healing wounds from such pernicious and repugnant conduct can still be felt today. However, the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion in our great country have contributed greatly to the healing of our society.

I believe each and every human being has a fundamental right to freedom of religion that should not be curtailed or circumscribed by the coincidence of one's citizenship in a particular nation. The freedom in our country to choose how to peacefully worship God is something many of us take for granted. We need only consider the unjust and inhumane treatment of Baha'is in Iran to realize that this freedom is not available to everyone in the world.

I agree with U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton when she condemned the sentencing of the Baha'i leaders and stated that the "United States is committed to defending religious freedom around the world, and we have not forgotten the Baha'i community in Iran."

I speak to you today as a reminder that religious persecution remains a fact of life in our

world and that the plight of the Baha'is in Iran is a poignant example of injustice. On behalf of my Baha'i constituents, I ask that you lend your voice to mine, so that we may create a chorus of diverse voices against the type of blatant religious persecution that we are witnessing in the unjust treatment of Baha'is in Iran.

**COUNTERING IRAN'S NUCLEAR & TERRORIST THREATS, THE OPPOSITION'S ROLE: WHAT ARE THE U.S. POLICY OPTIONS?**

**HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 22, 2010*

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to insert into the RECORD excerpts of remarks made at a symposium sponsored by Executive Action, LLC: "Countering Iran's Nuclear & Terrorist Threats, The Opposition's Role: What Are the U.S. Policy Options?" held at the Willard Intercontinental Hotel in Washington, DC on Friday, December 17, 2010.

MICHAEL MUKASEY, FORMER ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

This is one of those moments in history when we know that future generations are going to ask what we did to advance good and what we did to resist evil . . . .

I'm a lawyer, and lawyers make their cases with facts and law and policy. So let's look at some facts, and some law, and some policy, and see whether the case is there. The history of the relationship between the United States and the Iranian regime since the 1979 revolution can be summed up as a series of attempts by the United States to, as the diplomats say, engage the Iranian regime, each attempt less successful than the one that preceded it. I'm not going to go through that entire history, but an important part of it begins in the 1990s, during the Clinton administration, when the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran, also known as the MEK, was designated by the Secretary of State under U.S. law as a foreign terrorist organization and that designation regrettably continues to this day . . . .

The MEK is the only organization of Iranians, both inside Iran and outside Iran that opposes the current regime that favors a government in Iran that is democratic, secular, non-nuclear, and a republic. Again, this is not one of the few organizations that fit that description; it is the only one . . . .

If in fact MEK has renounced violence, as it has; if in fact it presents no threat to any U.S. personnel or interest, in fact it presents no such threat; and if in fact it has been of affirmative assistance to the United States, as it has; and is not regarded as a terrorist organization in the United Kingdom or the European Union, then why was it placed on that list and why does it continue to remain on the list of such organizations that is kept by the Secretary of State? Well, I think, it's pretty openly acknowledged that the reason MEK was placed on that list during the Clinton administration was to curry favor with Iran, and to use the designation as a way of entering into dialogue with the Iranian regime. And I am sorry to say that even during the administration that I served in, it is reported that MEK continued to remain on the list for the same misguided reason . . . .

The Iranian regime is now in the enviable position of having the United States designate as a terrorist organization a group of Iranians who are a threat to that regime,

and of limiting that group's activities. In other words, the Iranians now have the great Satan working for them . . . .

The continued designation of MEK as a terrorist organization gives great comfort and legitimacy to the Iranian regime, by putting on the sidelines an organization that is potentially a grave threat to the regime. What's to be done? Well as I'm sure many of you know there is an ongoing case in which MEK has challenged the designation. In July, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit issued an opinion essentially sending the matter back to the State Department and to the Secretary of State and asking her to re-evaluate whether MEK should be on that list. But the court did something more than that. It expressed a good deal of skepticism at least about the non-classified information that was put before the court and shared with MEK, and which MEK could therefore rebut. Without getting into a whole lot of detail, the Secretary of State may choose to base her determination entirely on classified information if she wants, and then nobody knows why she made the decision, but she didn't do that in this case. She said she based her decision on both the classified information and the non-classified information and the court discussed in some detail some of the non-classified information, and it showed that a lot of it consisted of unsubstantiated, anonymous rumor, whose reliability was unknown and could not be tested. And all we can say is that if the classified part of the record, which MEK has not been allowed to see and to which it cannot therefore respond to directly, consists of the same kind of information as the non-classified part, then the Secretary of State's decision would be based on absolutely nothing substantial. Time will tell. But this is about more than a case in the District of Columbia and more than MEK. This is about the posture of the United States toward the Iranian regime . . . .

When succeeding generations consider the question I presented at the beginning of these remarks, of what we did to advance what is good and to resist what is evil, they will find an answer that we and they can live with.

TOM RIDGE, FORMER SECRETARY OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY

At one point in time, we talked about and we put the MEK on the terrorist list because we thought it might enhance and improve the dialogue, change the dialogue. There might be some noticeable improvement in our relationship with Iran and I think history concludes so far in the past several years since we put that organization, which by the way disarmed itself, consolidated itself and has been a source of some very important intelligence for this country's use and the rest of the world's knowledge. If the goal was to improve engagement and to solicit a different response from the Iranian government, that hasn't worked out very well either. So, you say to yourself at the end of the day, these efforts during the past several years have been fruitless, and some say through some organizations that are basically feckless, not terribly effective. What happens if they become even further emboldened by having nuclear capability? One, we know what it says about Iran—if you think that part of the world is unstable now, we can only imagine what the consequences will be then . . . .

And you know what is probably even more alarming is that we're starting to see more and more analysts accept in their writings the notion of a nuclear Iran and how we would deal with it. Think about that, ten years ago we were worried and trying to fig-

ure out how we could make sure that didn't happen and now we have some pundits and some analysts in the international community saying, it's almost a fait accompli, "now what are we going to do?" Let's just pause for a moment and think what that means to the rest of the world vis-a-vis America. What does it say about our ability to influence geopolitical events? What does it say about how our allies and friends in that region look to us, and our ability to affect change that affects their lives and the security of that particular region. . . . ?

So how do we go forward? What do we do next? I think the Attorney General very clearly identified probably one of the most significant things we can do and that is delist as the UK has done, and the European Union has done, MEK. They did consolidate. They did disarm. They were a source of considerable intelligence for us, and if we are to look for peaceful means of encouraging a regime change, it seems to me that one of the first and most significant steps we could take, I guess it's under review right now by the State Department, but as you well know in January of this year I think the DC Circuit Court of Appeals said that, based on the information you presented in this court right now (and unfortunately you had to go to court, everybody goes to court in the United States, but to get them delisted from the State Department) the court said preliminarily, the information that you've at least shared with us in court today doesn't warrant them being listed as a terrorist organization. I think the consequences of that particular decision, the State Department as I understand it and perhaps others on this panel can give us a more enlightened and more recent point of view that they're actually honestly and actively considering that outcome.

What's the benefit of that outcome? First of all it's the strongest possible signal that our approach toward Iran is changing. It's saying that 30 years of peaceful engagement hasn't been effective, and I think everybody around the world knows that. But I'm going to give you a different perspective if I might because I think it has as much to do as how we're viewed around the rest of the world and why I think we should do it as soon as possible. I've always thought that, if America was considered to be a product that we look to sell around the world then our brand is based on our value system. Think about that for a moment. For 200+ years, more recently we have tried to promote the notion of civil society, and civil institutions, and believing that in the heart of all men and women everywhere around the world there is a desire to be free, a desire to control your own destiny, to raise your own family, to share in hopefully, the opportunities that your society and your government would provide for you. In inheriting all of that, we have many of those discussions as it relates to how we are engaged in our effort against terrorism around the world. We challenge ourselves around Abu Ghraib, we challenge ourselves around Guantanamo, we challenge ourselves with regard to due process. We know what we stand for. It's part of the American brand. We are our strongest allies; we're also our strongest critics. We know what we believe in and when we seem to deviate, if some of us seem to think we deviate from that brand, we take a close look at ourselves in the mirror and ask ourselves "What are we doing?" Well, part of that American brand I think is being consistent with our values overseas as well. And when we see a repressive theocracy, day in and day out, imprisoning, torturing, executing men, women, entire families because they've been brave enough, courageous enough to stand in opposition to the theocracy. In their hearts, not